



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/491,841      | 08/23/1999  | Britta Daume         | 6887                | 9106             |

7590                  05/10/2002

Shlesinger Arkwright & Garvey LLP  
3000 South Eads Street  
Arlington, VA 22202

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

LUEBKE, RENEE S

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2833     |              |

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                          |                                      |                              |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | Application No.<br><b>09/491,841</b> | Applicant(s)<br><b>Daume</b> |
|                          | Examiner<br><b>Renee S. Luebke</b>   | Art Unit<br><b>2833</b>      |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Renee S. Luebke

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Michael M. Zadrozny

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview May 9, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic      b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes      e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Identification of prior art discussed:

Cauderay and Tinnerman

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant stressed that the protrusions were formed with the band on the present invention. A number options were discussed about how to make this clear. The use of "formed intergrally" would be acceptable and would overcome the rejection under 102. However, a 103 rejection based on Cauderay in view of Tinnerman would likely result.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

RENEE S. LUEBKE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2833



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.